

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION TWO**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICHARD ANTHONY PACHECO,

Defendant and Appellant.

E035102

(Super.Ct.Nos. FWV026978 &  
FWV17566)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Paul M. Bryant, Jr.,  
Judge. Affirmed with directions.

Patrick E. DuNah, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In San Bernardino Superior Court case No. FWV17566, Richard Anthony Pacheco  
(defendant) pled guilty to petty theft with a theft prior. (Pen. Code, § 666.) He was  
granted probation, which he violated three times. After the last time, the trial court  
sentenced him to two years in prison, to run concurrently with the time imposed in San

Bernardino Superior Court case No. FWV026978 following a revocation of probation in that case. In case No. FWV026978, defendant pled guilty to petty theft with a prior and was granted probation. Upon violating that grant, he was sentenced to prison for three years.

Defendant appealed and upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493], setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which he has not done.

We have now concluded our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

#### DISPOSITION

The trial court is directed to amend the abstract of judgment in case No. FWV17566 to show that the two-year term imposed is to run concurrently with the three-year term imposed in case No. FWV026978, and to show credits were awarded for 420 actual days and 210 conduct credit days, for a total of 630 days. The trial court is further directed to amend the abstract of judgment in case No. FWV026978 to show this credit calculation. In all other respects, the judgments are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS

RAMIREZ  
P. J.

We concur:

HOLLENHORST  
J.

KING  
J.